

The materials produced herein are intended for the sole use of law students at the University of Toronto.

CASES AND MATERIALS ON FAMILY LAW

Volume 1

EDITED BY

BERNARD GREEN

1985-86

LAW LIBRARY

AUG 2 2 1985

FACULTY OF LAW UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

FACULTY OF LAW LIBRARY UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

The materials produced herein are intended for the sole use of law students at the University of Toronto.

CASES AND MATERIALS ON FAMILY LAW

Volume 1

EDITED BY

BERNARD GREEN

1985-86



Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Ι.	The Constitutional Framework: Division of	0
	Powers and Charter of Rights	2
	Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms	3
	U.S. Bill of Rights	
II.	The Legislative Framework	7
III.	The Institutional Framework	7
	A. The Courts	7
	B. Other Agencies	8
	C. The Lawyer	8
	Reisman, "Beyond the Call of Obvious Duty"	8
	Shadow of the Law: The Case of Divorce"	11
IV.	Some Views on the Family and Marriage	14
	Pope Pius XI, On Christian Marriage	17 22
СНА	PTER TWO: FORMATION OF THE FAMILY UNIT ANNULMENT	
I.	Introduction	35
II.	The Constitutional Issue	36
	Bushnell, "Family Law and the Constitution"	36
III.	The Regulation of the Formation of Marriage	37
	A. Statutory Conditions	37
	Licence and formalities	37 37
	B. Effect of Failure to comply with statutory conditions	41
	Marriage Act	42 46

1 V .	THE	Cond	ittions imposed by the common Law	43
	Α.	Intr	coduction	49
	В.	Marr	and parental consent	51 52 53
	С.	A ma	in and a woman	55
	D.	Who	are free to marry	56
			riage Acte and Mail	57 60
	Ε.	Who	consent to marry each other	60
		(1)	Mental Capacity	60
			Marriage Act Chertkow v. Feinstein Whitaker v. McNeilly Webb Re McGill	60 61 64 66
		(2)	Mistake as to the nature of the ceremony	69
			Jiwani	69
		(3)	Mental reservations	71
			Gardner	71 73
		(4)	Duress	74
			Thompson Truong (Malia)	74 79
		(5)	Fraud	79
			Moss H. v. C.	79 79
	F.	And	who are able to consumate the marriage	81
		(1)	What constitutes consummation	81
			BaxterWilkinson	81 81

		(2)	Inab	ility	to	consummate	82
			Heil Gaja				82 85
V.	Def	ences	to a	Null	ity	Action: Approbation or Insincerity	86
	Hah	10, Ni	ullit	y of	Mar	criage in Canada	87
VI.	The	Null:	ity D	ecree			88
	Α.	Juri	sdict	ion a	nd (other matters	88
	В.	Confi	licts	prob	lem:	ns	88
	С.	Econo	omic	conse	que	ences	88
	D.	Chil	dren	• • • • •			88
СНА	PTER	THRE	E: D	IVORC	E		
1.	Gro	unds			_		89
	Α.						89
							90 90
	В.	Immed	diate	reli	ef:	the fault grounds	93
		(1)	Adul	tery		,	93
			(a)	What	it	is	93
							93 96
			(b)	Prov	ing	g adultery	98
				(i)	Sta	andard of proof	98
				(ii)	Metl	chods	98
					1.	Physical condition	98
					2.	Circumstances	98
						Little	98
					3.	Admissions	99

				Divorce Act Evidence Act Culembourg	. 99				
			4.	Other decrees	. 101				
				Coles	. 101				
	(2)	Othe	r sexual mis	sconduct	. 103				
	(3)	Crue	lty		. 104				
		Divo	rce Act	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. 106				
		(a)	Relevance o	of the common law alimony standard	. 106				
			<u>N. v. N.</u>		. 106				
		(b)	Grave and w	veighty conduct	. 110				
			Feldman Wittstock Shumila Elbaz		. 111 . 113 . 114 . 118				
		(c)	The relevan	nce of intention	. 121				
		(d)	The time pr	roblem	. 125				
С.	Dela	yed r	elief: mari	tal breakdown	125				
	Divo	rce A	ct		. 125				
	(1)	Impr	isonment		. 126				
	(2)	?) Addiction							
	(3)	Disa	ppearance		127				
	(4)	Non-	consummation	1	127				
		Chir	ayath		127				
	(5)		•	and apart in the absence of	. 129				

		Divo	rce Act	129
		(a)	"Separate and apart"	131
			J.B. v. A.W.B. Dislippe Boechler Lachman	131 135 136 137
		(b)	Desertion	140
			(i) Without just cause	140
			Struk	140
			(ii) And with the itention to remain apart permanently	142
			<u>Lilley</u>	142
II.	Bar	s and	<u>Defences</u>	142
	Α.	The	possibility of reconciliation	142
		Gera	rce Actnsky	142 143 144
	В.	Abso	lute bars applicable to all grounds	146
		(1)	Collusion Divorce Act Sopinka, "The Divorce Act 1968, Collusion Confined"	146 146
			Singh	152
		(2)	Fraud Fromovitz	152 152
	С.	Disc	retionary Bars	157
		(1)	Connivance	157 157
			on Divorce	157
			(a) Consent	160 160
			(b) The problem of investigation	163 163 163

			(c)	Termination of connivance	164 164					
		(2)	Cond	onation	167					
			(a)	Introduction	167 167 168					
			(b)	The common law	170 170 171 177 178					
			(c)	The effect of the Divorce Act Divorce Act Boivert v. Marineau Nolan Ross Blackburn Brown Blue Roschuk	179 179 181 185 185 186 187 189					
		(3)	The	exercise of discretion	191					
			Divo Blun	erce Act	191 191					
	D.	Spec	ial b	ears applicable only to s. 4 grounds	192					
		Divo	rce A	ct	192					
	Ε.	The	probl	em of insanity	194					
III.	Nat	ature and Consequences of Divorce								
	Α.	Juri	sdict	ion	194					
		Divo	rce A	ct	194					
	В.	Reco	gniti	on	195					
		Divo	rce A	ct	195					
	С.	Cons	equen	ices	196					
		(1)	Stat	us	196					
			Baia Hutc Hunl	chins	196 197 198 198 199					

	(2)	Economic	200
	(3)	Children	200
	(4)	Costs	200
		Bregman	201
		Andrews	203
DEED D	#011p		
Int	roduc	tion	206
Own	ershi	p of Property	208
Α.	Intr	oduction	208
			208
	The	F.L.A. (Bill 1, 1985)	217
В.		•	222
		·	222
	Pett	kus v. Becker	223 224
			234 238
С.	The	F.L.R. Act	240
	(-)	of all types of assets	240
		(a) Standing	240
		(b) Trusts and presumptions of trusts	241
		(c) Private agreements: domestic contract	241
	(2)	Family assets and division of family and non-family assets	242
		(a) What is a family asset?	243
		(b) Powers of the court in dividing property	244
		(i) General	244
		(ii) In relation of family assets	245
		(iii) In relation to non-family assets	246
	Own. A. B.	(3) (4) PTER FOUR Introduct Ownershi A. Intro Pear Law The B. The t. Murd Pett Murr Marv C. The (1)	(3) Children (4) Costs Bregman Andrews PTER FOUR: ECONOMIC RELATIONS BETWEEN "SPOUSES" Introduction Ownership of Property A. Introduction Pearlman Reforming the Family Law Reform Act Law Reform Comission of Canada, Family Property The F.L.A. (Bill 1, 1985) B. The law prior to the F.L.R. Act; the law after: the use of the trusts Murdoch Pettkus v. Becker Murray v. Roty Marvin C. The F.L.R. Act (1) Provisions applicable to determining ownership of all types of assets (a) Standing (b) Trusts and presumptions of trusts (c) Private agreements: domestic contract (?) Family assets and division of family and non-family assets (a) What is a family asset? (b) Powers of the court in dividing property (i) General (ii) In relation of family assets

D.	The c	ase 1	aw	247
	(1)	What	is family asset?	247
			man eatherdale	247 251 252
	(2)		will the court make an unequal division f family assets?	252
		(a)	The effect of gitfs	253
			Silverstein Bregman Weir Ling Piskor	253 257 258 258 259
		(b)	The Effect of agreement other than a domestic contract	259
			Burton Miller	260 262
		(c)	Equal division inequitable in the circumstances	264
			Weir Ivanovich	264 266
	(3)		will the court make a division of non-family ssets?	268
		(a)	The impact of s. 4	268
			Silverstein Bregman Re Young Collville-Reeves Leatherdale	269 270 272 273 275
	(4)	The	impact of s. 8	278

]	Silverstein Re Young Leatherdale Moog Van de Mark v Walton Palachik	279 280 283 284
III.	Muti	ual D	uty o	f Maintenance	289
	Α.	While	e Mar	ried or Cohabiting	289
		(1)	The !	law prior to the F.L.R. Act of 1978	289
		(2)	The :	Family Law Reform Act of 1978	289
	В.	On B	reakuj	p of Marriage or Cohabitation	290
		(1)		can claim: the problem of "common aw" spouses	290
			Re_S	ly Law Reform Acttoikiewicz and Filas	
			S	ick v. Ministry of Community & ocial Serviceserson v. Russell	_
		(2)	When	can claim be made?	296
			(a)	Nullity	296
			(b)	Divorce	297
				Divorce Act	297
				and the F.L.R. Act	299
			(c)	On death of one of the parties	302
				Succession Law Reform Act	302
		(3)	What	types of order can be made	302
			(a)	Non-monetary	302
				The special problem of possessory rights in the matrimonial home	303
				(i) Definition of matrimonial home	304
				(ii) Protection accorded a spouse in the	305

	(iii)	Powers of court to alter occupancy	
			Janssen Partition Act.	30. 30. 30.
	(b)	Mone	y Awards: Types	310
		(i)	Periodic payment orders	31(
			Family Law Reform Act	310 311
		(ii)	Lump sum	31
	(iii)	Secured	31
			Family Law Reform Act	
(4)	Fact	ors	affecting momentary awards	313
	(a)	Law M Fami	oduction	312
	(b)		will a court order that a lump sum e paid	322
		-	fran man	323 323 325 327
	(c)		ors (other than counduct) affecting uantum of award	330
		Silve Moog	iams ard ier v Delage erstein	330 333 334 336 342 345 347
	(d)	The	significance of conduct	350
		(i)	Under the F.L.R. Act	350

			Ī Ī	West McCabe Rocha C. v C. (No. 2)	351353
			(ii) N	Under the Divorce Act	. 355
	(5)	Vari	ation of Av	Awards	. 356
h.		Divo John McQu Neal	rce Act stone ilkin v. Da	form Act Dawson	356 357 360 362
IV.	-			Contracting Out, Welfare Federalism	. 366
	Α.	Cont	racting Out		. 366
		(1)		tion	
		(2)	Property		. 367
			Deroon Couzens Trottier	aw Reform Act	369371372
		(3)	Maintenan	nce	. 374
			Fami	er Provincial Legislation	375
			Mance	Ce	. 377
			Divo Newm Webb Joyce	2	. 379 . 381 . 387 . 392 . 393
				gely Separation Agreements	

	В.	Welfare	403
		General Welfare Assistance Act	403
		Ending March 31, 1982	406 407
		Ending March 31, 1982	411 413
	С.	Problems of federalism	418
		<u>Sniderman</u>	419
СНА	PTER	FIVE: CHILDREN	
I.	Int	roduction	421
	Fam Suc	ldren's Law Reform Act	422 423 423 424
II.	Pro	ving and Disproving Parenthood	424
	Re Re Min	ldren's Law Reform Act H and H Bagarie Rhan istry of Community and Social Services and Tolls	424 428 432 433
III.	The	Right (or Privilege) to Raise or See One's Children:	
		Guardianship, Custody, Care and Control, Access	437
	Α.	Introduction	437
	В.	Private Disputes	439
		(1) Custody	439
		(a) Legislative framework	439
		Children's Law Reform Act	439 445 446 449

(b)		general principles: what the academic	
	h	ave said	450
	Moon!	er and Freed, "Child Custody"kin, "Child-Custody Adjudication; udical Functions in the Face of	450
		ndeterminacy	456
(c)	Powe	rs of the court	481
	(i)	Who has standing to apply for custody Smith v. Sears	481 482
	(ii)	Award to a person not a party to the action	484
		Re Fulford and Townshend	484
(iii)	Joint custody order	486
		Krueger Fontaine Zwicker v. Morine Field	486 495 496 497
	(iv)	The effect of an agreement between the parties	500
		Children's Law Reform Act	500 501 502
(d)	Inter	rim custody	502
	Divo	dren's Law Reform Act	502 503 503
(e)	Perma	anent custody	505
	(i)	The impact of conduct	505
		Divorce Act	505 506 507 508 512

		(ii) Race	517
		HayreSingh	517 519
		(iii) Tender years and plans	520
		MacDonald Talsky R v R Mireault Wakaluk Romeyko Bayda, "Procedure in Child	520 522 527 533 535 540
		Custody Adjudication	542
		(f) Custody after death of natural gardian	547
		Children's Law Reform Act	547
	(2)	Disputes between parents and third parties	548
		CLRA J. v C. K.K. v G.L.	548 549 552
	(3)	Access	556 556 558 563 565
С.		gency	568
	(1)	State intervention: the "Pure welfare" of 1965"	568 574
		(a) General	574
		(b) Jurisdiction	575
		(c) Process	579
		(d) Powers on making a finding	584
		(e) Accountability: review and appeals	586
		Richardson, Unpublished paper	592
		Services, 51st Annual Report	598

		Re C.C.A.S. and Pamela M. Re Brady Infants C.A.S. of Winnipeg v. Molyneux and Porteous Tom v. Winnipeg C.A.S.	600 611 613 618
		Note, "The Custody Question and Child Neglect Hearings" Re Cordes - Saathoff and al and C.C.A.S.	620
		of Metro Toronto Re D.L.C. and C.W.C.	627 630
		(2) State intervention: the quasi-welfare approach	633
		Juvenile Delinquents Act	633 637
IV.	Ado	ption	651
	Α.	The statutory scheme	651
		Child Welfare Act	651
		Services, 48th Annual Report	666 667
	В.	Consent of natural parents	667
		Re A L and L v. Legal Aid Manitoba Racine v. Woods Re Windsor Re Sobering et al and Sergeant	668 672 672 675 678
	С.	The religious factor	680
		Petch, "Re Lamb Religious considerations in Ontario Adoptions"	680
	D.	The search for natural parents or child	686
		Child Welfare Act Erguson v. Director of Child Welfare	686 688
	Ε.	Access After Adoption	690
		G.G.W. v. M.J. at al	690 694
V.	The	Parental-Child Relationship	700
	Α.	Parental Control	700

			Report	700
В.	Econ	omic	Relations	704
	(1)	Pare	ental obligations to child	704
		(a)	General	704
			Ontario Law Reform Commission, "Report on the Age of Majority"	704
		(b)	Legislative framework	707
			Family Law Reform Act Child Welfare Act Divorce Act	707 711 712
		(c)	The work of the courts	713
			Waters v. Nicholls Re Dolabaille and Carrington Clark Janzen Harrington Gartner Hock Walls v. Hanson	713 715 718 720 723 725 726 728
		(d)	The effect of death	729
			Succession Law Reform Act	729 736
	(2)	The	child's duty to maintain his parents	737
		Succ	ly Law Reform Act ession Law Reform Act Joseph's Health Centre	737 739 742
CHAPTER S	IX:		ECTION OF THE FAMILY UNIT NST INTERFERENCE BY THIRD PARTIES	
1. Betwee	en Hi	usban	d and wife	744
			form Commission Report waw, Part I: Torts	744
of	Act	ion f	se for Retention of Causes for International Interference rital Relationship''	750

(xviii)

	Leaphart and McCann, "Consortium: An	
	Action for the Wife"	754
	Ontario Law Reform Commission Report	
	on Family Law, Part I: Torts	760
	Family Law Reform Act	763
II.	Between Parent and Child	763
	Ontario Law Reform Commission Report	
	on Family Law, Part I: Torts	763
	Family Law Reform Act	766
	IMMITTY DAM MOTOTH MOTO " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " "	. 0 0

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

I. The Constitutional Framework: Division of Powers and Charter of Rights

The Constitution Act allocates exclusive legislative power over some aspects of family law to the provinces and over others to the federal government. It is questionable whether the allocation is rational.

The provinces have exclusive legislative power in relation to

- solemnization of marriage [s.92(12)]
- property and civil rights [s.92(13)]
- charities [s.92(7)]
- the administration of justice within the province [s.92(14)]
- the appointment of judges of inferior courts [s.92(14); 96]

The national government has exclusive legislative power in relation to

- marriage and divorce [s.91(26)]
- criminal law [s.91(27)]
- the appointment of judges of the superior courts [s.96]

We have referred to the provinces' exclusive legislative power in relation to the appointment of judges of inferior courts and the central government's exclusive legislative power in relation to the appointment of judges of superior courts. The Supreme Court of Canada recently had to consider whether the action of British Columbia in vesting adoption and other jurisdiction in its provincial court judges was ultra vires. See Re Family Relations Act of B.C. (1982) 40 N.R. 206.

Several cases decided by the highest courts have turned on the constitutional issue, e.g. Kerr, referred to in Chapter Two. The division of powers between the federal and provincial governments has forced legislative draftsmen into some awkward corners. For example, section 20 of Ontario's Family Law Reform Act requires the suspension of any application for support or custody under that Act, if an action for divorce is commenced under the federal Divorce Act. While satisfying constitutional dictates, this provision has caused confusion and has resulted in tactical maneuvering by counsel. (See also the Family Relations Act (B.C., ss. 5-8). For a recent discussion, see Colvin, Family Maintenance: The Interaction of Federal and Provincial Law (1979), 2 Can. J. Fam. L. 22]



CHAPTER TWO: FORMATION OF THE FAMILY UNIT AND ANNULMENT



"Let's buy the American dream together."

I. Introduction

The material in this chapter deals with the following problems:

- (a) which jurisdiction the provinces or the federal government has the power to formulate the conditions that must be met before a marriage may be celebrated?
- (b) what conditions must be satisfied before a legally valid marriage is created and what is the effect of a failure to meet these conditions?



CHAPTER FOUR: ECONOMIC RELATIONS BETWEEN "SPOUSES"

I. Introduction



"When you wake up, you will be generous. Very, very generous."

In this chapter we examine the two basic aspects of the economic relations between husband and wife, and peripherally, between unmarried cohabiting couples. These aspects are:

- (1) property rights
- (2) maintenance (support) obligations

The law in this area has undergone very significant changes in the last few years. The major change has been legislative as exemplified by the Family Law Reform Act which came into force in 1978. The F.L.R.A. changed the law relating to maintenance (support) as well as to property.

Other changes have been made by the courts. The most important of these has been the development of the constructive trust concept by the Supreme Court of Canada. See Pettkus v Becker and Leatherdale reproduced infra.

As a result of these changes unmarried cohabitees now have some (but not all) of the rights and obligations of married persons; women who are not in the labor market are now accorded more property rights. The question to be determined in whether more change is still needed.

To answer that question requires that you examine two basic assumptions of our present legal system: that marriage (or now, in certain cases, cohabitation) imposes economic obligations on the parties to it and that the state provides help to society's losers, but only as a last resort.

In your reading of the following material consider your present and future family situations and those of your clients and then attempt an assessment of our system in light of this formulation of the problem:

"The main problem which every system...has to solve is the reconciliation of the needs of the household as an economic unit with the ideas of individual ownership on the one hand, and with the claims of the spouses' kinship groups on the other."

Kahn-Freund, "Matrimonial Property Law in England," in Matrimonial Property Law (Friedmann, ed.), 287.

Is it possible to achieve justice in this field regardless of the system in force in a particular jurisdiction? Consider this case: H and W were married in 1958; their son was born in 1960; their marriage ended in 1968. H was a musician and part-time teacher; his annual income was between \$1,000 - \$3,000; W was a lawyer earning \$25,000 at the end of the marriage and was a 40% partner in her firm.

At the time of marriage the parties moved into a home owned by W. This home was sold by W and the proceeds (\$25,000) deposited into her account. W owned other real estate property before marriage and acquired still other parcels afterwards worth over \$100,000.

What share, if any, should H obtain? Why? Cf. Mix (1975) 536 P 2d 479 (Calif. S.Ct.) Should H be able to obtain support from W? Why? If yes, what amount would you award?

Should the parties be able to provide by agreement for results different from those that you have considered just?